Remarks:

In an Office action dated November 17, 2004, the Examiner indicated that the application contains patentably distinct inventions including:

I. Claims 1-26, drawn to "A method of preparing a surface for adhesion", "A

method of increasing adhesion of an adhesive to a substrate", "A method

of eliminating interfacial failure between a first component and an

adhesive in a print cartridge", classified in class 427, subclass 207.1.

II. Claims 27-29, drawn to "An interface between a first component and an

adhesive", classified in class 428, subclass 343.

III. Claims 30-32, drawn to "A printer", classified in class 347, subclass 86.

The Examiner further indicates that the inventions of Group I, Group II and Group III

"are related as process of making and product made." However, the Examiner asserts

that the inventions are distinct because "the printhead cartridge assembly surface can

be made by etching, sputtering, or micromachining," apparently referring to his

indication that inventions are distinct if it can be shown that "the product as claimed can

be made by another and materially different process." This is not the case in the

instant application.

Claims 27 and 30 each recite "a surface prepared by providing initiators on the

surface that are configured to partially shield a portion of the surface and by directing a

laser toward the surface to affect ablation of a non-shielded portion of the surface and

further allowing ablated material to resettle to form structures on the surface." The

Examiner's assertion that the "surface can be made by etching, sputtering, or

micromachining" this is unfounded. Furthermore, despite the Examiner's assertion,

Page 8 -

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT ...

Serial No. 10/052,815

HP Docket No. 10012053-1

KH Docket No. HPCC 321

Ø1012/012

235039729115

applicants note that claim 27 does not even recite a printhead cartridge. The restriction requirement thus should be withdrawn.

Nevertheless, in view of the Examiner's indication that any reply to the Examiner's restriction requirement "must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement is traversed," applicants have elected the invention of Group 1, with traverse. Claims 27 and 30 thus are withdrawn, also with traverse. Claims 28, 29, 31 and 32 are cancelled without prejudice.

In view of the Examiner's restriction requirement, applicants have added new claims 33-36, which depend from elected claims 1 and 10.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.

Walter W. Karnstein Registration No. 35,565 Customer No. 23581

520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 200

Portland, Oregon 97204 Telephone: (503) 224-6655 Facsimile: (503) 295-6679

Attorney for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

hereby certify that this correspondence iş being facsimile transmitted Examiner J. Stephens, Group Art Unit 2853, Commissioner for Patents, at facsimile number (703) 872-9306 on December 17, 2004.

Christie A. Doolittle

Page 9 -

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT ...

Serial No. 10/052.815 HP Docket No. 10012053-1 KH Docket No. HPCC 321